
'Our Luck Stopped Here': How Trumanism Overturned Roosevelt's World

by Stuart Rosenblatt

The name of the late President Harry S Truman is being dredged up once again to justify pre-emptive American military action in the Middle East and the creation of an equally noxious Department of Homeland Security in the continental United States. It is important to set the record straight at this late moment on the true legacy of Harry S Truman, before, to quote Hamlet's friend Horatio, "More mischance at errors happen."

On Jan. 6, Arnaud de Borchgrave, editor of the *Washington Times*, and intimate of the utopian military conspirators grouped around Henry Kissinger and Samuel Huntington, penned an editorial calling for the instigation of a "Truman Doctrine II" policy. The original, inspired by America-hater Winston Churchill, was directly responsible for launching the Cold War that broke apart the coalition that had saved the

world in World War II.

On June 6, President George W. Bush announced the creation of the new Cabinet-level Department of Homeland Security; he called it the most important development since the 1947 National Security Act, when Harry Truman launched a sweeping reorganization of many Federal agencies. Truman's action launched a domestic witch-hunt later misnamed McCarthyism, but more appropriately called Trumanism.

The Democratic Party's faction calling for "perpetual war" and domestic police statism, is also citing Truman. In a bloodcurdling speech given at Georgetown University on Jan. 14, Democratic Senator Joe Lieberman (Conn.) invoked the name of Harry Truman in launching his demand for the unilateral U.S. invasion of Iraq and other Arab states. Lieberman tried to "spin" his policy of anti-Islam war as a new form of

the “Iron Curtain” speech given in 1946 in Fulton, Missouri by Winston Churchill to an enthusiastically applauding Truman. “The fanatical forces of *jihad*,” said Lieberman, “are trying to build a ‘theological iron curtain’ to divide the Muslim world from the rest of the globe.” Rep. Richard Gephardt (D-Mo.), another warhawk, has also referred to Truman in his calls for invasion, and the website of the Democratic Leadership Council (www.ndol.org) has prominently displayed the rantings of former CIA chief James Woolsey in his calls for attack; Woolsey also harkens back to the geopolitical “Truman Doctrine.”

The 1945-52 administration of President Truman represented a complete reversal of all that Franklin Delano Roosevelt had accomplished.¹ Truman dismantled the New Deal and imposed draconian austerity in the United States—provoking immediate economic recession—and, through the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank, on war-ravaged nations around the world. He dismantled the Bretton Woods financial system, as originally conceived by Roosevelt, and used economic imperialism to achieve Anglo-American geopolitical objectives. He dropped the atomic bomb on Japanese cities for no military purpose, and at the instigation of Churchill and the American military “utopians,” dismantled the Roosevelt wartime coalition. Instead of collaboration with Russia and other sovereign nation-states, he initiated the Cold War. Rather than dismantle the British, French, and Dutch empires as Roosevelt had promised, these colonial powers were bolstered and strengthened against their colonies by Truman’s White House (see Michael Billington, “When

1. That Truman ever ascended to the White House at all was the result of the re-emergence of a nefarious coalition of Northern, Wall Street-allied, Democratic bosses, and Southern Dixiecrats, who foisted Truman onto the Democratic ticket in 1944. He was a shallow-thinking pragmatist, shepherded into politics by the Kansas City mob grouped around Tom Pendergast. Truman never aspired to anything of national significance, and when initially offered the position as Roosevelt’s running mate, he flatly turned it down. He was drafted into the role by Democratic Party Chair Robert Hannegan and Bronx political boss Edward Flynn, at that time the Democratic king-makers. They took advantage of a severely ill Franklin Roosevelt, who was more preoccupied with winning the war than choosing a Vice President. These men also conspired with Jimmy Byrnes and other “Southern strategists” to move out New Deal spokesman Vice President Henry Wallace, and move in the completely malleable Missouri haberdasher, Truman.

Wallace, then the second most popular man in the country after FDR himself, was committed to carry on the breakthroughs of the New Deal at home and a Roosevelt “community of principle” foreign policy. This was anathema to the Wall Street elite, who, sensing that FDR would not live out another term, pulled every trick in the book to get Truman the Vice-Presidency.

Truman was the candidate acceptable to the anti-FDR “rejectionist front” which later, around candidate and President Richard Nixon, became known as the Southern Strategy (see *EIR*, Jan. 17, 2002). He hailed from a Missouri family that had ties to the pro-slavery terrorists of the Kansas-Missouri Act, and he himself had flirted with membership in the KKK to get elected in the 1920s. He was a perfect tool for Dean Acheson, banker Averell Harriman, and the Wall Street Democratic enemies of both FDR and his likely successor Henry Wallace.

America Let Britain Run, and Ruin, U.S. Asia Policy,” *EIR*, Sept. 7, 2001).

We treat here three crucial manifestations of this still-lasting misfortune of Truman’s conduct of the Presidency: his complete reversal of FDR’s successful domestic and foreign economic policy, which had brought the United States out of Depression and through the War; his militarily unjustified and disastrous use of nuclear weapons to launch the era of Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD); and why McCarthyism should really have been called “Trumanism.”

Dismantling Bretton Woods

For the dire economic record of the IMF, known now internationally as the destroyer of national economies, and for never once having failed to worsen the economic situation of any nation in which it became involved, we have to thank President Harry S Truman, and the people he appointed to replace those FDR had intended to run the Fund.

The post-war economic policy animating the Truman Administration was a return to the economic prescriptions—defeated by FDR’s historic 1932 Presidential campaign—of the Wall Street-controlled Coolidge and Hoover administrations. Were it not for the intervention of the limited, but highly successful Marshall Plan, the United States and Europe would have been plunged into the same economic nightmare from which America only emerged with the war effort of 1941-45. Overall, Truman’s “Fair Deal” was a complete repudiation of the New Deal.

Wall Street took control of all aspects of policymaking. The Truman domestic economic policy quickly reinstated the Depression from which the country had recently escaped. The best marker of the Wall Street domination was the budget slashing/balanced budget insanity—reminiscent of that of the Hoover Administration. Where Roosevelt’s final wartime budget in 1945 was \$67 billion, Truman’s initial budget proposal, for 1946, was \$35.5 billion, a nearly 50% reduction in government economic activity.

This and related policies created chaos. Strike waves and shortages engulfed the nation. In October 1945, there were 275 strikes in process; but by January 1946, some 4.5 million strikers were on the picket lines, protesting low wages, high prices, and economic austerity. The country was on the verge of economic collapse throughout 1946, as a result of Truman’s imposing austerity policies on an economy that should have been converted to domestic industrial expansion.

Most of the FDR Cabinet quit during the first year. They were replaced by low-wattage Truman cronies such as Treasury Secretary John Snyder and Agriculture Secretary Clinton Anderson. In other areas, the FDR holdovers were isolated and in retreat. Wall Street was on the ascent.

Nowhere was this more evident than in the foreign policy area, especially where it pertained to implementation of the Bretton Woods accords. Truman’s team sought to eradicate not just the wartime U.S.-Russia alliance, but the FDR per-



President Harry Truman (right) and Prime Minister Winston Churchill, en route to Fulton, Missouri in March 1946 for Churchill's famous "Iron Curtain" speech. During the Truman Presidency, the United States executed British geopolitical doctrine under the banner of fighting a "Cold War" against Communism.

spective for a post-war "community of principle" among many nation-states, in which that common principle was supposed to have been economic development. The Wall Street moguls moved to dismantle all but a memory of both the New Deal and the original Bretton Woods arrangement of late 1944.

McCloy Closes World Bank Window

Typical of the approach was John J. McCloy's handling of the lending practices of the World Bank. The twin pillars of the Bretton Woods system, as enunciated by Roosevelt in early 1945, were the IMF and the World Bank. The latter—originally called the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development—was organized for the purpose of rebuilding a war-torn, starving world.

The World Bank's first president under Truman was the publisher of the *Washington Post*, Eugene Meyer, who resigned abruptly in late 1946 after failing to issue even one loan from the bank. Meyer was at odds, from the start, with the executive director of the bank, Pete Collado, an associate



John J. McCloy

of FDR's Bretton Woods architect, Harry Dexter White. The staff of the bank and its board all were of the New Deal persuasion, and were eager to issue as many loans as possible. Meyer fought them on the grounds of "fiscal responsibility," and his Truman-appointed successor, McCloy, would prove more intransigent.

McCloy was the ultimate creature of the British-American-Canadian establishment, the "BAC." In World War II he served as Henry Stimson's Assistant Secretary of War, and, as Stimson's protégé, came to typify the breed of Wall Street lawyer that would come to dominate U.S. policymaking during the 20th Century. His outlook was entirely antagonistic to that of Franklin Roosevelt, and his policies epitomized the tight-fisted, economist royalist behavior so pilloried by FDR.

In March 1947, McCloy agreed to serve as president of the World Bank, but only on his own terms. These "terms" amounted to nothing less than an overthrow of the Bretton Woods principles. He ousted the executive director, Collado, moved to have all power placed in his own hands for the ultimate disbursement of monies, and brought in board members of his own Chase Bank to oversee the operations of the World Bank. This was all accomplished with the public urging of the leading Wall Street bankers: Harold Stanley, president of Morgan Stanley and Co.; Baxter Johnson, president of Chemical Bank; Randolph Burgess, vice-chairman of National City Bank; George Whitney, president of J.P. Morgan and Co.—all were in on the anti-FDR coup at the World Bank.

“Wall Street methods” quickly replaced New Deal policies. Typical of the new atmosphere was the forced resignation of Harry Dexter White from the IMF, in March 1947. White retreated to join the flagging efforts of Henry Wallace, the New Deal Commerce Secretary who had been sacked by Truman in the Fall of 1946, and who was preparing his own run for President. But though he was forced out at the bank, Wall Street was not done with White, an icon of the New Deal. In 1947, he was fingered at a Congressional hearing by Elizabeth Bentley, a former Communist Party member, as a Soviet spy. Subpoenaed before a Congressional hearing where he vigorously defended himself, White suffered a heart attack under the strain, and died several days later, the first such victim of that “Trumanism” later called McCarthyism. A key architect of Roosevelt’s New Deal was gone.



Harry Dexter White

Though the World Bank had \$8 billion capitalization—comparable in its initial size to the later Marshall Plan—McCloy had no intention of loaning out the money. He ran the bank like any other conservative Wall Street institution. *His rule of thumb was that the loan total would never exceed the combined U.S. and Canadian subscription amount.* Second, he marketed the securities of the bank on Wall Street with the same fastidiousness of other proper bankers, and announced that the bank would rely for most of its capital on the proceeds from the sale of its securities. He pledged to his colleagues no “wild” lending practices.

These practices signalled the political intent of his policies. He would use the bank as an instrument, not of development, but to further the globalist “Cold War” agenda of the Anglo-American elites.

The World Bank vs. National Sovereignty

In April 1947, Chile, Poland, France, and several other nations had submitted loan applications. The first loan went to France, then in the throes of an economic emergency, but with a coalition government that included a member of the Communist Party. France requested \$500 million to finance imports of food, fuel, and industrial machinery.

After much haggling, McCloy finally agreed. But the terms were a harbinger of the “IMF conditionalities” of the 1990s. The French government pledged that the repayment of the loans would take priority over any other foreign debt. The bank would move in to supervise the running of the French economy. The government must balance its budget, increase taxes, and cut consumption of luxury imports. Further, it would have to remove the duly elected member of the

Communist Party from the government. The French protested the infringement of their national sovereignty; McCloy would not budge.

Finally, the French pushed the Communists out of the government, and McCloy proceeded. Ultimately, he allocated only half of the promised loan, and even then, delivered the money only after he had successfully floated the offering on Wall Street! He eventually blocked the other \$250 million.

While the Marshall Plan, which was critically needed for European reconstruction, given McCloy’s intransigence, was in the process of implementation, McCloy refused to use the World Bank even as a stop-gap. He denied the money to fund food aid to Europe while the Marshall Plan made its way through Congress. Said McCloy, “Europe itself must make the major contribution to the solution of all these problems. . . . Outside assistance is vital, but it represents a small percentage of the total effort. . . . The Bank is not in the stop-gap business.” The total amount of loans that McCloy would make to Europe, during his tenure, would be only just over \$500 million, an amount less than the initial interim aid to France alone voted on by the Congress in the Fall of 1947.

McCloy’s policy toward the East bloc countries was even more manipulative. The lending policy simply reflected British-orchestrated divide-and-rule prescriptions for the Cold War just declared by Winston Churchill.

The case of Poland was exemplary. Poland was a pivotal country. It had a Communist-led government by 1947, but was open to working with the increasingly anti-Communist West. In 1946, Poland applied for a \$600 million loan to buy coal-mining equipment from the West. This was rejected. In 1947, the request was scaled down to \$128.5 million. In June of that year, McCloy went to Poland to evaluate the loan and then stopped off in London, where he met with Churchill.

Churchill not only convinced McCloy not to loan money to Poland, but opposed the very idea of lending Western money to Eastern Europe. In late 1947, McCloy offered Poland a paltry \$25 million, and that with conditions. By mid-1948, Truman ordered the veto of any loan to Poland.

The Poles charged that the United States was using the World Bank to wage economic warfare against the East bloc. They charged as well, that the sum total of the loans to France and the Netherlands was precisely equal to the amount spent by their respective militaries in colonial Vietnam and Indonesia—that is, that the World Bank was paying only colonial nations’ expenses to repress their colonies, and nothing more.

Loans for Debt and Dictators Only

McCloy’s handling of Ibero-American loan applications was no less insane. Typical was the case of Chile. During 1948, after extensive touring of the ravaged areas of Ibero-America, McCloy finally made two World Bank loans to Chile, totalling \$16 million. Yet, even these loans were finalized only after Chile agreed to settle on previous loans totalling \$170 million, that had been defaulted on by the govern-

ment. McCloy thought it essential that the principle, no new loans until previous monies had been rescheduled or paid in full, had to be the guiding idea of bank policy. That prescription has never been revamped. It was seen in full force during the 1990s, denying loans for reconstruction of war-destroyed Bosnia—to take just one example—until that nation should pay off “its share” of the international debts of the former Yugoslavia.

McCloy only loaned out a pittance more to the rest of Ibero-America as a whole. Virtually all the monies went to nations run by dictators, including the Somoza family of Nicaragua, because McCloy believed that dictators kept their nations in superior fiscal condition.

These examples are paradigmatic. The Bretton Woods agreements had envisioned a post-war world guided by the domestic principle embedded in the New Deal: to promote the general welfare of all the people. Roosevelt sought to extend this to the entire world, including the Soviet Union and its neighbors.

At the conclusion of the 1944 Bretton Woods conference which established the IMF and World Bank, the Russians agreed to raise their subscription to the bank from \$900 million to \$1.2 billion. But in 1945, the Truman Administration abruptly cancelled Roosevelt’s Lend-Lease program, and refused to extend to the Soviets \$6 billion in post-war credits. The situation quickly deteriorated, and in 1946 the Soviets refused to join the World Bank and IMF.

While the Marshall Plan was a much-needed economic antidote to the insanity of McCloy’s handling of the World Bank, it was aimed at the political consolidation of Western Europe under the Anglo-American umbrella. And it was deliberately promulgated to block the possibility of Soviet collaboration.

Thus, under the Presidency of Harry Truman, the economic policies of the New Deal were abandoned at home and abroad. The Marshall Plan, designed by the same cabal of pro-British globalists who were running the Cold War (Dean Acheson, Averell Harriman, George Kennan, and others), had as its intent, to bolster the Western Alliance against Stalin’s Russia. A central feature was the economic revival of West Germany, which ironically, with its Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (Reconstruction Bank), serves even today as a model for the implementation of what were supposed to have been the universally applied methods of the Bretton Woods institutions. However, the intent was to further isolate and confront the now consolidating Soviet bloc.

Hiroshima Decision: The Defining Disaster

What potential there was, at Roosevelt’s death and after, for his goal of a post-war *community of principle* of the great powers to de-colonialize and develop the Third World, was destroyed from the moment of the (militarily useless) immolation of Hiroshima.

On Aug. 6, 1945, an American B-29 bomber, the *Enola*

Gay, dropped a nuclear bomb on Hiroshima, Japan, instantly killing over 70,000 innocent civilians. Several days later, the second atomic bomb in the U.S. arsenal was detonated over Nagasaki, drastically changing the direction of American policymaking away from that envisioned by Franklin Roosevelt.

This was to be the defining moment of the Presidency of Harry S. Truman.

From the military standpoint of defeating the Japanese adversary, the bombing was completely unnecessary, and this was known to be the case by the highest-ranking U.S. military officers in command, who opposed it (see box).

But, from the vantage point of political conspirators determined to terrorize the world into accepting what they called “world government”—the 20th-Century version of British imperial domination—the nuclear attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were the critical element in their vile enterprise.

All that was evil around the Truman Administration flowed from this crucial event, like some pent-up rage given means to escape. The fell purpose of the conspirators, who were known to themselves and to others as the British-American-Canadian (“BAC”) Establishment, was both to obliterate all that was accomplished by the Franklin Roosevelt Presidency, and to march the world on the path to global government.

From the terrible use of the nuclear bombs in 1945 they would unleash the Cold War; its domestic corollary, the Truman-initiated witch-hunts known as McCarthyism; the re-establishment of colonialism in Indo-China; and the emerging depravity of the counterculture, initiated by the likes of Aldous Huxley and Aleister Crowley.

Whereas the Roosevelt Administration mobilized that which was noble in the American population to confront their personal and political fears, first in the fight against Wall Street and the City of London’s Depression, and later against its Nazi military machine during World War II, the controllers of the Truman Administration unleashed those same fears, and manipulated and all but destroyed the psyche of an entire generation of Americans, in the name of fighting a Cold War.²

2. This drastic change in direction, obvious to many outside the Truman circle, was captured by the late President’s son and confidant, Elliott Roosevelt, in the introduction to his book, *As He Saw It*. Published in 1946, the book was a scathing attack against Winston Churchill in particular, prompted by the shocking turn in American national policy:

“The decision to write this book was taken more recently, and impelled by urgent events. Winston Churchill’s speech at Fulton, Missouri, had a hand in this decision; the meetings of the Security Council at Hunter College in New York City and the ideas expressed at those meetings, were influential; the growing stockpile of American atom bombs is a compelling factor; all the signs of growing disunity among the leading nations of the world; all the broken promises, all the nascent power politics of greedy and desperate imperialism, were my spurs in this undertaking.”

Elliott Roosevelt was speaking for a minority viewpoint of American patriots and intellectuals steeped in the traditions of American System thinking, as recently practiced by the late President. They would be thrown increasingly on the defensive during the British-orchestrated folly of Harry Truman’s eight years in the Presidency.

Commanders Opposed Truman on Hiroshima

From Dwight Eisenhower's *Mandate for Change*: "The Secretary [of War, Stimson], upon giving me the news of the successful bomb test in New Mexico, and of the plan for using it, asked for my reaction, apparently expecting a vigorous assent.

"During the recitation of the relevant facts, I had been conscious of a feeling of depression and so I voiced to him my grave misgivings, first on the basis of my belief that Japan was already defeated and that dropping the bomb was completely unnecessary, and secondly because I thought that our country should avoid shocking world opinion by the use of a weapon whose employment, I thought, was no longer mandatory as a measure to save American lives. It was my belief that Japan was, at that very moment, seeking some way to surrender with a minimum loss of 'face.' The Secretary was deeply perturbed by my attitude, almost angrily refuting the reasons I gave for my quick conclusions."

Gen. Douglas MacArthur, who was the commander of the theater in which the bombs were to be used, was *not* consulted. He had already sent his air chief, Gen. George Kenney, to Washington in the Spring of 1945, to report that Japan was on the brink of surrender. MacArthur's sole concern was that the Emperor be allowed to maintain a position in post-war Japan. If the Emperor gave the order to surrender, MacArthur knew, all Japanese troops would surrender. Kenney came back to report to MacArthur that he had not succeeded in convincing his superiors in Washington. On the day after the bombing, MacArthur's pilot, Weldon E. Rhoades, noted in his diary: "General MacArthur definitely is appalled and depressed by this Frankenstein monster. I had a long talk with him today, necessitated by the impending trip to Okinawa. He wants time to think the thing out, so he has postponed the trip to some future date to be decided later."

Years later, MacArthur told *Saturday Review* editor Norman Cousins, that his advice had not been sought. "He saw no military justification for the dropping of the bomb," Cousins reported. "The war might have ended weeks earlier, he said, if the United States had agreed, as it later did anyway, to the retention of the institution of the Emperor."

Herbert Hoover, who had advised Truman against dropping the bomb, met with MacArthur for several hours on a trip to the Pacific in early May 1946: "I told MacArthur of my memorandum of mid-May 1945 to Truman, that peace could be had with Japan by which our major objectives would be accomplished. MacArthur said that was correct and that we would have avoided all of the



Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the commander of the theater in which the nuclear bombs were used in 1945, was not consulted beforehand by the Executive branch. After the militarily pointless bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, MacArthur was "appalled and depressed by this Frankenstein monster," wrote his pilot.

losses, the Atomic bomb, and the entry of Russia into Manchuria," Hoover wrote in his diary.

Another prominent opponent was Roosevelt's chief military aide, Adm. William Leahy, who continued to serve under Truman. On June 18, 1945, Leahy had written in his diary: "It is my opinion that at the present time a surrender of Japan can be arranged, with terms that can be accepted by Japan, and that will make fully satisfactory provision for America's defense against any future trans-Pacific aggression." In 1949, Leahy would tell his biographer, Jonathan Daniels: "Truman told me it was agreed they would use it, after military men's statements that it would save many, many American lives, by shortening the war, only to hit military objectives. Of course, then they went ahead and killed as many women and children as they could, which was just what they wanted all the time."

Ernest King, chief of Naval Operations and chief of the U.S. fleet, concurred with the predominant Navy thinking that an invasion would never be needed. In his autobiography (written in the third person), King wrote, "The President, in giving his approval for these attacks, appeared to believe that many thousands of American troops would be killed in invading Japan, and in this he was entirely correct; but King felt, as he had pointed out many times, that the dilemma was an unnecessary one, for had we been willing to wait, the effective naval blockade would, in the course of time, have starved the Japanese into submission through lack of oil, rice, medicines, and other essential elements."

—William C. Jones

Who Dropped the Bomb, and Why?

The drive to build the bomb had been launched by the Hungarian physicist Leo Szilard, who—helped by key British allies—organized the 1940 meetings through which he, Albert Einstein, and Edward Teller convinced Franklin Roosevelt to launch the Manhattan Project. Szilard was a devotee of British political and cultural intelligence agent H.G. Wells and a cohort of Wells' associate Bertrand Russell. The scenario played out from Hiroshima on, was contained in the written schemes of these two nefarious characters, Wells and Russell.

The story has been well documented (see Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr., "In Defense of Strategy," *21st Century Science & Technology*, Summer 2000). Wells and Russell worked together on and off for over 40 years, the most articulate spokesmen for the most extremely anti-human factions of the British oligarchy. They openly promoted an imperialist-fascist scheme for world government, which would make enormous strides during the Truman years.

In 1914, Wells had penned the influential book *The World Set Free*, which presented a scenario for an atomic war set in 1956, that would destroy all of Europe's major cities and lay the basis for a world government, to be run by former monarchs and a U.S. President. This was a blueprint for the development and use of atomic bombs pushed relentlessly by his protégé Szilard, who acknowledged that he had been thinking along Wells' line continuously, from reading Wells' book in 1916, until Hiroshima in 1945.

In 1928, Wells laid out his master plan for the globalist regime in *The Open Conspiracy*.³ Four years later, in 1932, Wells dramatically fleshed out his scenario in *The Shape of Things to Come*, a dark drama of prolonged world war and annihilation, followed by the imposition of a global dictatorship run by the utopian "Airmen." This latter was produced as a feature-length film, anticipating World War II and what the Wells-Russell faction hoped would be its resulting global dictatorship.

3. The book was a clarion call for the overthrow of the nation-state and the entirety of Western civilization; the destruction of organized religions, especially Christianity; and the assertion of a "World Directorate." Its premise is the need to carry out a radical Malthusian policy of population control and resource allocation. Wells praised the Italian Fascisti as one model of his proposed new order.

The key parameters of his bizarre new world bear reporting:

"1. The complete assertion, practical as well as theoretical, of the provisional nature of existing governments and of our acquiescence in them;

"2. The resolve to minimise by all available means the conflicts of these governments, their militant use of individuals and property and their interferences with the establishment of a world economic system;

"3. The determination to replace private local or national ownership of at least credit, transport, and staple production by a responsible world directorate serving the common ends of the race;

"4. The practical recognition of the necessity for world biological controls, for example, of population and disease;

"5. The supreme duty of subordinating the personal life to the creation of a world directorate capable of these tasks and to the general advancement of human knowledge, capacity and power." (*The Open Conspiracy* [Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday Doran and Co., 1928] pp. 142-43.)

This strategic perspective, for a world dictatorship, including control and suppression of technology ("technological apartheid"), facilitated by the threat of a nightmarish bomb, has been the determining principle of Anglo-American "utopian" policy for the past 55 years (epitomized by the Huntington-Kissinger-Brzezinski current, derived from the Nashville Agrarians' William Yandell Elliott of Harvard). The name attached to the scheme has altered—one-worldism, world federalism, globalization, universal fascism, competing spheres of influence—but the strategy of the utopians has not.

At the center of the project around Truman were Winston Churchill, who was with Truman at Potsdam when the orders were given to drop the bomb; Truman's go-between with Churchill and sometime controller, Jimmy Byrnes; and Wall Street power-broker Henry Stimson.



Henry Stimson

From Roosevelt's untimely death in April 1945 onwards, Secretary of War Stimson maneuvered for the remainder of the war to ensure that the bomb was dropped. He blocked action on all Japanese peace overtures, despite the aggressive moves of the Vatican emissary Monsignor Montini (later Pope Paul VI) and his American interlocutor Max Corvo of the OSS, to end the war, and despite the contrary plans of Gen. Douglas MacArthur. Stimson rewrote all language in a proposed armistice to rule out retention of the Emperor, a key demand of the Japanese, and one that would ultimately be fulfilled. He even delayed the start of the Potsdam peace talks, to coincide with the successful tests of the nuclear devices at Alamogordo, New Mexico.

The war with Japan should have been halted long before the Fall of 1945. Everyone knew it. General MacArthur's blockade had so tightened a fatal noose around the Japanese mainland, that all high-ranking flag officers were anticipating surrender. There would be no need for a bloody invasion. Contrary to the myths that were circulated by Truman and his various apologists, including Stimson, and Stimson's ghostwriter McGeorge Bundy, the dropping of the bomb did *not* save 1 million U.S. servicemen. This lie was circulated by the perpetrators of the nuclear incineration to cover their larger machinations. Even Bundy later admitted, when it was politically useful to do so, that dropping the bomb was militarily unnecessary.

The British-American-Canadian Cabal

One might say that authors Evan Thomas and Walter Isaacson, in their book *The Wise Men*,⁴ damned Harry Truman with faint praise in their assessment of the stark difference

4. Walter Isaacson and Evan Thomas, *The Wise Men* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1986).

between FDR and Truman in their conduct of policy. “Perhaps the most significant difference was that Roosevelt handled foreign policy out of his own pocket. He could respect a man like Harriman while at the same time maintaining a bemused distance from some of his advice. He could indulge or ignore a Kennan, or a Bohlen, or even an Acheson. Be it at Teheran or Yalta or in the White House Map Room, Roosevelt relied on no State Department briefing books or even a Secretary of State; Edward Stettinius had even less influence than his dreamy predecessor in the post, Cordell Hull. With Hopkins as his arms and legs, Roosevelt personally handled the making of policy.

“Truman had no desire to do the same. ‘I may not have much in the way of brains,’ he told one Cabinet member shortly after taking office, ‘but I do have enough brains to get hold of people who are able and give them a chance to carry out responsibility.’” Thomas and Isaacson quote McGeorge Bundy that Truman “was not an initiator but a chooser; the buck stopped here, but he waited for the buck to arrive.”

The inner circle of Truman’s advisers included the leadership of the BAC, dubbed, inappropriately, the “Wise Men,” by authors Isaacson and Thomas. They included Anglophile Dean Acheson, later Truman’s Secretary of State; Moscow Ambassador Averell Harriman, the Bank of England- and Morgan-allied banker who was chief Democratic Party power-broker; State Department *agents provocateurs* George Kennan and Charles Bohlen; World Bank President and Wall Street fixer John J. McCloy; Undersecretary of State and Harriman intimate Robert Lovett; Ambassador to the Court of St. James and former OSS official David Bruce; and many others of the same utopian strategic outlook.

These men all hailed from the same prep schools, Ivy League universities, and Wall Street banks or law firms. They constituted the Foreign Policy Establishment; they functioned mainly above parties, though if pushed, would call themselves “liberal” (certainly, from Hiroshima onwards, they killed liberally) Republicans.⁵

5. This American arm of the BAC is traceable to Theodore Roosevelt (“TR”), and the defining moment for the crystallization of their existence would be their shared experience at the Plattsburgh Training Camps in 1915-16. Plattsburgh was conceived by TR and his cohort Gen. Leonard Wood, of Rough Rider lore, as a recruitment ground for pro-British stalwarts, who could drag a reluctant United States into World War II on the British side. These camps for the so-called Best and the Brightest of the day were organized by Wall Street insider and TR acolyte Grenville Clark, who was to remain a key fixture in the U.S. policy establishment for over five decades. The money-bags behind Plattsburgh was the ubiquitous, George Soros-like stock market speculator Bernard Baruch.

All of the “right” people attended the encampments. They practiced at war during the day and heard rousing anti-German, pro-British oratory at night, delivered by Clark, Wood, and TR himself. Attendees ranged from the Mayor of New York to Secretary of War Henry Stimson, then nearly 50 years old. Among the luminaries were David Bruce, Willard Straight (of Morgan Bank and New Republic fame), John J. McCloy, and TR’s sons.

This group founded the Preparedness Movement, which galvanized the American wing of the BAC. Its leading light for the next 30 years was former and future Secretary of War Stimson. Stimson forged the interventionist

During World War II, FDR recruited the internationalist Stimson to be his Secretary of War, to ensure Republican support for the war. Stimson’s top aides included McCloy and Lovett, dubbed the “imps of Satan” by Stimson himself. His *aide de camp* was Harvey Bundy, married into the notorious Lowell family of Boston slave- and dope-trafficking infamy. Bundy’s sons, McGeorge and William, were mentored by Stimson, and emerged in the leadership of the utopian military faction of the BAC in the 1960s and 1970s. McGeorge Bundy, as dean of Harvard in the 1950s, and William Yandell Elliott, the Anglophile pro-Confederate who ran Harvard’s Government Department, spawned the next generation of disease-riddled “utopians” of this geopolitical stripe, including Henry Kissinger, Zbigniew Brzezinski, and Samuel P. Huntington.

The circles of banker Averell Harriman overlapped the Stimson grouping. Harriman played a crucial role in Wall Street operations during the Truman period, and his intimates included both business partner Lovett, and the group around Prescott Bush. As has been well documented, this nest of traitors launched the Nazi-aping eugenics movement in the 1920s, and directly intervened to install Adolf Hitler as Chancellor of Germany in 1933.

Dean Acheson was a boyhood friend of Harriman; they “coached crew” together at Yale. Acheson was the son of the Episcopal bishop of Connecticut, who was British by birth and a Canadian citizen through his young manhood. Acheson was a thorough-going Anglophile who spent evenings devouring the writings of British imperial strategists Lord Palmerston, Lord John Russell, and William Gladstone, and day-times implementing their precepts. Acheson was also a devotee of Stimson.

The Anglophiles inside the Truman Administration were also ensconced in the State Department, their purpose to dismantle the wartime alliance of the United States and Russia, ally the United States with our former enemy Great Britain, and terrorize the world into submission to Anglo-American world government.

Against this pack of tricksters, the remnants of the Roosevelt tradition stood little chance. Roosevelt’s Vice President, Henry Wallace, would be drummed out of office for defending the Russian-American alliance and not succumbing to anti-Communist propaganda. Harry Hopkins and others were on their last legs, and American System economic proponents, typified by Bretton Woods architect Harry Dexter White, were terrorized by the domestic witch-hunters into early deaths or departures.

‘Preventive Nuclear War’ and Geopolitics

Under FDR, the United States had resumed its traditional anti-British posture of the previous 150 years, albeit in a necessary wartime alliance. The United States had also resumed

foreign policy matrix that recruited American brawn to the service of British “brains” during the 1920s and early 1930s.



Churchill, Roosevelt, and Stalin at Yalta, 1945. The prospect of a post-war world dominated by a Roosevelt-inspired United Nations and Russian-American cooperation terrified the British. Their counterstrategy revolved around nuclear weapons policy.

its historic cooperation with Russia, dating to the 1778 League of Armed Neutrality and the active Russian defense of the Union against projected British intervention during the U.S. Civil War. This posture was well documented by Elliott Roosevelt, FDR's son, who accompanied him on all the war-time summits, and reported on the criticisms and confrontations of FDR against Winston Churchill. This outlook was merely typical. Henry Luce's *Life* magazine had front-page stories attacking the British Empire, and one key aspect of the Bretton Woods agreements was the call for dismantling the Imperial Preference system of Commonwealth trade. A Gallup Poll taken in 1945, with the war about to be won, reported that over 60% of Americans were anti-British!!

Anti-British outlooks abounded at all levels. A 1945 report from U.S. Ambassador to Britain, Joseph Davies, warned of British moves to break up the wartime alliance and play the United States against the Russians. Davies reported: "I said frankly, as I had listened to him [Churchill] inveigh so violently against the threat of Soviet domination and the spread of Communism in Europe, and disclose such a lack of confidence in the professions of good faith in the Soviet leadership, I had wondered whether he, the Prime Minister, was now willing to declare to the world that he and Britain had made a mistake in not supporting Hitler; for as I understood him, he was now expressing the doctrine which Hitler and Goebbels had been proclaiming and reiterating for the past four years in an effort to break up Allied unity and 'divide and conquer.' Exactly the same conditions which he described, and the same deductions were drawn from them as he now appeared to assert."

Davies then submitted his formal report to Truman: "The Prime Minister is a very great man, but there is no doubt that he is first, last, and all the time a great Englishman. . . . I could not escape the impression that he was basically more concerned over preserving England's position in Europe than in preserving peace."

The prospect of a post-war world dominated by a Roosevelt-inspired United Nations and Russian-American cooperation terrified the British. The determining element of their counterstrategy revolved around nuclear weapons policy.

Following the lead of Bertrand Russell and Winston Churchill, the British oligarchy moved quickly to parlay the fact that the United States possessed the only nuclear arsenal extant, into their utopian scheme of global domination. The equation was rather simple: The United States had the bomb, no one else did; and the United States under Truman had just blown up two cities and left the world in shock, precisely as H.G. Wells had demanded.

Russell's Call for U.S. To Bomb Russia

With the nuclear cloud barely evaporated from Nagasaki, Lord Bertrand Russell published an article in *Cavalcade* magazine on Oct. 20, 1945, "Humanity's Last Chance," calling for a pre-emptive nuclear attack on Russia. Several excerpts capture the insanity prevailing in British policy circles at that moment:

America has at this moment, and for a few years to come, an opportunity such as has never hitherto come to any nation throughout the whole history of the world.



With the nuclear cloud barely evaporated from Nagasaki, Lord Bertrand Russell called for a pre-emptive nuclear attack on the Soviet Union, should that country refuse to join his utopian world government scheme. "I see a world government as extremely important and I do not expect to see it established without an element of compulsion," he wrote.

If the opportunity is used to the full, the peace of the world will be secure for a very long time; if not, it is likely that, during the lifetime of the present generation, all large cities in every part of the world will be wiped out. . . .

At present, the United States alone possesses finished atomic bombs; the United States, Canada and Great Britain alone know the details of the process by which they have been manufactured. But [soon] every nation which chooses to spend the money will be in a position to make its own bombs. . . . Every considerable country will be in a position to launch a surprise attack, in the style of Pearl Harbour, on any other country at any moment.

To tell Russia how to make atomic bombs would shorten the period of American supremacy, and might therefore, contrary to everybody's intention, hasten the advent of another world war. Whatever measures are to be taken to prevent another world war must be taken during the brief period of American supremacy, and must be enforced by a vigorous use of that supremacy, which should be used, not to secure special advantages for the United States, but to compel the world to adopt a system making great wars improbable.

I make, however, one exception to the condemnation of wars in the near future: a powerful group of nations, engaged in establishing an international military government of the world, may be compelled to

resort to war if it finds somewhere an opposition which cannot be peacefully overcome, but which can be defeated without a completely exhausting struggle. Even in this case a war will not be justified unless the international government to be established is to have certain merits. . . . I see a world government as extremely important and I do not expect to see it established without an element of compulsion.

Repeating this idea several times, Russell then demanded that a confederation of nations be created immediately to execute his plan. The confederation would be led by the United States. All nations participating would agree to relinquish their national sovereignty, at least so far as military considerations would apply, and in turn to create a powerful, centralized world military police force. This "army" would be empowered to both "inspect" other nations' stockpiles of weapons to ensure there were no violations, and to initiate a war in the event of resistance.

Russell concluded with a condemnation of the Soviet Union, followed by a direct threat:

The U.S.S.R., we should hope, would also join [the new Confederation], but it might refuse. . . . But against such a bloc even the U.S.S.R. would be powerless, at any rate while the U.S. still retained the lead as regards the atomic bomb, which would now be a lead of the Confederation. . . . If the U.S.S.R. did not give way and

join the Confederation, after there had been time for mature consideration, the conditions for a justifiable war, which I enumerated a moment ago, would be all fulfilled. A *casus belli* would not be difficult to find. Either the voluntary adherence of Russia, or its defeat in war, would render the Confederation invincible, since any war that might occur would be quickly ended by a few atomic bombs.⁶

The Baruch Plan

Following Russell's lead, the United States moved to implement the call for a nuclear weapons control policy that would pave the way for world government. The resulting effort would produce the Baruch Plan.

In January 1946, President Truman launched a committee to formulate a nuclear weapons proliferation policy. The committee was chaired by Dean Acheson and included James B. Conant, president of Harvard; Vannevar Bush, head of the Carnegie Institution in Washington; former Assistant Secretary of War John J. McCloy; and Gen. Leslie Groves, former director of the Manhattan Project. McCloy and Acheson were Stimson's most influential protégés, and the rest had been on the top-secret Interim Committee, which had orchestrated Truman's decision to drop the bombs in 1945.

In the Spring of 1946, the committee issued the Acheson-Lillenthal report, a blueprint for global control of nuclear weapons. The group proposed to create an International Atomic Development Authority, which would own and mine all the uranium and thorium deposits in the world, as well as the nuclear production facilities, including those used for peaceful manufacture of nuclear energy. (The U.S. Navy had already successfully produced nuclear power reactors to power ships, and was experimenting with their "portside" use for on-land power.) The United States would agree to halt all bomb production as a sign of good faith, and the world's nations would be encouraged to give up their sovereignty, and likewise agree not to produce nuclear materials. The International Authority would be the sole repository of nuclear materials.

However, to ensure that this would be rejected by the Soviet Union, Truman appointed Bernard Baruch to "sell" the package to the world. Baruch was a Wall Street shark and con artist; FDR had specifically rejected him to run the War Production Board, for which Baruch was the Establishment's "consensus" choice. The retooled "Baruch Plan" bore his stamp. It contained two major alterations: There would be "immediate and sure punishment" of "rogue states" for violation of the plan; and such punishment, presumably including war, would not be subject to veto by any UN signatory.

In effect, this was a reworked version of Bertrand Russell's provocative *Cavalcade* article of six months earlier.

The plan was dead on arrival in Moscow. The Soviets refused to participate, but this played right into Russell's hands. The drive for pre-emptive war would continue, and the Russian rejection of the Baruch Plan merely aided the effort.

Russell, Churchill, and Nuclear War

Russell, Churchill, Szilard, and their cohorts actively propagandized for pre-emptive war by the United States against its wartime ally Russia, from 1945 onward. The British and their U.S. acolytes carried out two parallel strategies: to manipulate the United States into launching a nuclear strike against the Soviet government; and, failing that, to maneuver the United States into a close alliance with Britain and to wage a geopolitical war, a Cold War, against Russia.

The "failure" of the Baruch Plan, which served merely to test how far the Soviet government would capitulate to world control by the British, provided the perfect foil to pursue the preferred doctrine: nuclear war against Soviet Russia and subsequent global domination by the BAC powers.

In August 1946, Churchill, now no longer Prime Minister, confided to a friend, Charles Moran, that a war with Russia was necessary, and should begin soon, within a few years at most. "We ought not to wait until Russia is ready. I believe it will be eight years before she has these bombs. . . . America knows that 52% of Russia's motor industry is in Moscow and could be wiped out by a single bomb. It might mean wiping out 3 million people, but they think nothing of that."

Later in 1946, Churchill met again with Moran and was even more emphatic on the need for an early attack. When Moran asked him if war between the United States and the Russians might commence in two or three years, Churchill blurted out, "Perhaps sooner than that, perhaps this Winter. They have twelve divisions. They could march to the Atlantic in a few weeks. The Swiss are most perturbed. Only the atomic bomb keeps the Russians back. They're making rockets to fire on us when they get to the coast."

Bertrand Russell kept up the drumbeat for pre-emptive war for the next two years. In the Spring of 1947, he issued an article dubiously entitled "The Prevention of Atomic War," and then spoke on his plan in a rare appearance at the House of Lords. His theme was again the need to compel the Russians to join a global confederation to impose control over nuclear weapons, and the issue he raised was, "How much coercion is enough?"

In the article, which appeared in *Plain Talk*, he called for the creation of an International Authority "that really governs . . . not a pretentious sham like the United Nations. . . . If Russia does not agree to join in forming an international government, there will be war sooner or later; it is therefore wise to use any degree of pressure that may be necessary."

In May 1948, Russell repeated his views in a letter to Dr. Walter Marseilles of California, who was supporting Russell's call for compulsory inspection of Russian military sites. "As soon as Russia rejected the Baruch proposals, I urged that all nations favoring international control of atomic energy

6. This and subsequent citations from Barry Feinberg and Ronald Kasrils, *Bertrand Russell's America*, Vol. II, 1945-70 (Boston: South End Press, 1983).

should form an Alliance and threaten Russia with war, unless it agreed to come in and permit inspection. Your proposal is, in effect, the same, for the compulsory inspection you advocate would be, legally, an act of war, and would be so viewed by the Soviet Government. . . . Even at such a price [a new European war], I think war would be worthwhile. Communism must be wiped out, and world government must be established. . . . I do not think the Russians will yield without a war. I think all (including Stalin) are fatuous and ignorant."

It was not until the Soviets had themselves developed the bomb, that Russell switched tactics and began his crusade to "Ban the Bomb," but still impose world government. The policy never changed, merely the tactics.

Advent of the 'Cold War'

Despite the total domination of Anglophile figures over Truman, the residual leadership of the previous Roosevelt Administration still exerted some influence. There was open advocacy of an alliance with Russia on the part of numerous leaders, typified by Commerce Secretary Henry Wallace. And there was also the emergence of a "Realist" faction, which promoted world government by recognition of spheres of influence to be respected by the Soviets, the United States, and the British Empire. Spokesmen for this faction included Stimson, McCloy, and columnist Walter Lippmann. It would be out of this latter grouping that the "arms control" movement would be fostered in the 1950s.

At the turn of the 1950s, while still beating the drums for a "hot war," and thus creating a controlled environment of nuclear madness, the British policy elite simultaneously manipulated the malleable Truman into accepting the parameters of a "cold war" against Russia. Thus, under the cover of a doctrine of atomic Mutual and Assured Destruction, the British initiated yet a new twist: Pit the United States against its wartime Russian ally in a Cold War, while cementing the "special Anglo-American relationship" so reviled by the American public.

Three crucial events occurred in the Spring of 1946 that launched the Cold War. On Feb. 22, George Kennan, State Department chargé d'affaires at the American Embassy in Moscow, cabled an 8,000 word "Long Telegram" to the State Department. Kennan, an anti-Russian, highly neurotic member of Averell Harriman's State Department Anglophile cabal, had been sending similar diatribes for years, only to have them filed in trash cans by Franklin Roosevelt and his allies. Instead, this *cri de couer* was widely circulated.

In brief, Kennan argued that the Russians were not open to an accommodation with the United States, but rather were bent on global conquest for ideological and historical reasons. They viewed the world as "evil, hostile, and menacing. . . . We have here a political force committed fanatically to the belief that with the United States there can be no permanent *modus vivendi*, that it is desirable and necessary that the internal harmony of our society be disrupted, our traditional way



A conference aboard Truman's yacht. Left to right; British Foreign Secretary Anthony Eden, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, President Truman, Prime Minister Churchill. Churchill's post-war policy can be summed up in his statement in Fulton, Missouri in 1946: "Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of world organization will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English speaking peoples. This means a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire, and the United States."

of life destroyed, the international authority of our state be broken if Soviet power is to be secure."

Kennan outlined his doctrine to replace the Roosevelt Grand Alliance with the nefarious scheme of "containment." "Impervious to the logic of reason, the Soviet Union is highly sensitive to the logic of force. For this reason it can easily withdraw, and usually does, when strong resistance is encountered at any point. Thus, if the adversary has sufficient force and makes clear his readiness to use it, he rarely has to do so."

Hard on the heels of this diatribe followed an even more vociferous call to arms. On March 5, 1946, an inebriated Winston Churchill delivered his famous "Iron Curtain" speech in Fulton, Missouri, with President Truman applauding each phrase. Intoned Churchill: "Now, while still pursuing the method of realizing our overall strategic concept, I come to the crux of what I have travelled here to say. Neither the sure prevention of war, nor the continuous rise of *world organization* will be gained without what I have called the fraternal association of the English speaking peoples. This means a special relationship between the British Commonwealth and Empire, and the United States. This is no time for generalities, and I will venture to be precise" (emphasis added). Churchill then enunciated a detailed plan for post-war military interlinking of the British imperial and U.S. armed services.

After going through his "Iron Curtain" analysis of Soviet intentions and claiming to be pointing out the path to avoid

otherwise inevitable U.S.-Soviet war, Churchill made clear that his demand for a new Anglo-American order was not for the short term, but for 100 years. "If all British moral and material forces and convictions are joined with your own in fraternal association, the high roads of the future will be clear, not only for us but for all, not only for our time, but for a century to come."

The Truman Doctrine

These two initiatives, by Kennan and Churchill, altered the political atmosphere beyond repair. They were followed by a series of shifts, including the Turkish crisis in the Summer and the firing of Commerce Secretary Wallace in the Fall of 1946.

The transformation was completed in the Spring of 1947, when the British contrived the Greece and Turkey financing crisis to sucker in the United States as their imperial marcher lord. Claiming financial bankruptcy, the British government pulled out of two imperial adventures in the eastern Mediterranean, including support for an overtly fascist/royalist regime in Greece, and demanded that the United States pick up the pieces.

With the atmosphere poisoned by the tales of Churchill, Kennan, Bohlen, and their ilk, a foolish U.S. administration rushed in to defend the British Empire against Communism. The lead "Venetian courtier" in this obscene drama was Anglophile Dean Acheson, who gave a rousing speech in a Cabinet meeting that turned the tide.

What ensued was the Truman Doctrine, an American stratagem modelled on all those "entangling alliances" once denounced by George Washington and John Quincy Adams. The United States would commit itself to execute British geopolitical doctrine under the dubious title of fighting a "Cold War" against Communism.

By 1947, a change in policy axioms had occurred. The United States had abandoned Franklin D. Roosevelt's revival of John Quincy Adams' "community of principle" among nations. The central idea in that policy, that of promoting policies that would engender the general welfare of the peoples of those nations by economic development, as typified by Roosevelt's New Deal and related legislation, was dropped. Instead, the Truman Doctrine declared the United States an appendage to the reconstituted British Empire against Russian, Chinese, and anti-colonial movements' threats. All policies of the increasingly degenerate Truman Administration would follow from this fundamental shift.

American involvement in Indo-China and the Korean peninsula flowed from the "containment" doctrine of Kennan and his allies, and adopted as policy by Dean Acheson, Dean Rusk, and others in the State Department. The issue was never "anti-Communism," but rather the control of decrepit colonial empires, those of Britain, France, and the Dutch monarchy.

Truman and the Origins of McCarthyism

The centerpiece of the continuously escalating "red scare" and witch-hunt which began under Truman's Presidency, was

the loyalty campaign which accompanied the 1947 National Security Act, cited now by President George W. Bush as the predecessor of the Homeland Security Act. While privately uncomfortable with FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover's demands for loyalty oaths, background checking, and the like, Truman himself initiated this precursor of the measures now being advocated by Attorney General John Ashcroft and Sen. Joe Lieberman.

Truman timed his "loyalty" campaign to coincide with the announcement of the Truman Doctrine, which launched the Cold War in earnest in 1947. On March 21, 1947, only nine days after his Truman Doctrine address to Congress on Turkey and Greece, Truman issued Executive Order 9835, creating the Federal Employees Loyalty and Security Program.

While FDR had initiated a limited program of background checks and loyalty oaths during the war, this was the first such policy ever begun in peacetime, and was far broader. Kowtowing to the Republican supporters of the witch-hunting House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC), Truman placed Republican lawyer Seth Richardson in charge of the Review Board.

All Federal employees were to be investigated, without exception. FBI and HUAC files were to be pulled on everyone. Dismissal could be based on the flimsiest pretexts—"reasonable grounds for belief that the person is disloyal." At no point was the term "disloyal" defined. The suspects were denied the right to question their accusers, know who they were, or even know the nature of the charges.

Attorney General Tom Clark was instructed to draw up a list of subversive organizations for further investigation. David Lillienthal, the head of the Tennessee Valley Authority, the showpiece of FDR's infrastructure development program, was one of those grilled. He said, "In practical effect, the usual rule that men are presumed innocent until proved guilty is in reverse."

In a typical Trumanism, the President stated, "I am not worried about the Communist Party taking over the government of the United States, but I am against a person, whose loyalty is not to the government of the United States, holding a government job."

From 1947 to 1950, some 3 million Americans would be investigated and ultimately cleared by the Civil Service Commission; 14,000 would be looked into by the FBI. Several thousand resigned their jobs, but only 212 were fired as a result of suspicious "loyalty." None were indicted, and not one person was accused of espionage.⁷

The beginnings of this new witch-hunt, the necessary corollary to ending the New Deal and confronting the Soviet Union, dated to June 1945, Truman's second month in office, with the FBI raid on the magazine *Amerasia*; it continued with the revelations by Elizabeth Bentley and Whittaker Chambers of supposed Communist infiltrators in the govern-

7. David McCullough, *Truman* (New York: 1992), pp. 550-553.

ment—even as the most dangerous spies, the infamous British double and triple agents in Washington embassies, the State Department, and the nuclear weapons program, were being cleared and promoted!

Similar smear campaigns had been attempted under FDR, but they had come to naught, because FDR had resisted them.

The dropping of the atomic bomb, and the subsequent official Anglo-American hysteria over nuclear weapons in Soviet hands, had been the psychological warfare mechanism that made much of this possible. In the United States, the dominant post-war mood of optimism changed, during Truman's Presidency, to fear and "going along to get along," particularly as economic recession marked most of that



Sen. Joseph McCarthy

Presidency. The loyalty-oath drive, falling into the hands of J. Edgar Hoover, Attorney General Tom Clark, and finally Sen. Joseph McCarthy, fostered American nativism and xenophobia. It was Harry Truman who spawned Joe McCarthy.

Not only did Truman dismantle FDR's foreign policies, he also dismantled the Roosevelt domestic coalition of the "core constituencies"—labor, farmers, African Americans—organized around the principle of promoting the general welfare, through economic/industrial growth for the entire nation.

Truman's Anglo-American controllers, from Churchill to Acheson and McCloy, despised the core constituencies. They sought to replace the American Dream with their own Wall Street nightmare. As they were imposing economic austerity at home, they were naturally in constant combat with organized labor, farmers, and blacks. As confrontations mounted with Russia, China, and other wartime allies, "anti-Communism" became a necessary component of the propaganda drive.

Disasters at the Top, Pessimism Below

Both the result, and the further breeding ground, for the hysteria, was the "escapism" of the returning veteran, who, rather than consider the direction in which the country must move following the cessation of hostilities, instead thought only of "making up for lost time." This meant making money, getting ahead, fleeing to the suburbs, keeping one's nose clean, staying out of trouble, and abiding by popular opinion. This escapist mentality, and its fear-driven "anti-Communism," would also be transmitted to the Baby Boomer offspring of these increasingly "little" returning GIs.

That there were leftist sympathizers all over the U.S. government during the New Deal and the war mobilization was never in question. That there were "liberal thinkers" of all stripes in and around the administration, was encouraged by Franklin Roosevelt. It was Truman, under sway of Churchill,

Harriman, and company, who fanned the flames of the anti-Communist hysteria. The House Un-American Affairs Committee had commenced in 1938. During the 1940s, the committee, also known as the Dies Committee, for its chairman, Martin Dies, had attacked every New Dealer it could, but with no success. FDR resisted their depredations. Truman did not.

Truman's collaborators in this campaign of slander and abuse were, most importantly, J. Edgar Hoover, who was unleashed on government employees and then the public in 1946, and Attorney General Tom Clark. Clark had previously been head of the Criminal Division of the Department of Justice, and had worked closely with Hoover. Together they launched all the original attacks against the alleged "fellow travellers" of Communism.

Their moves coincided with each escalation against the Soviet Union. In the Summer of 1946, when the Truman Administration was involved in the Iran and Dardanelles crises with Russia, Hoover began his campaign of intimidation.

The announcement of the Truman Doctrine in March 1947 brought on the real escalation. The Report of the Temporary Commission on Employee Loyalty was actually delayed until after the announcement of the Truman Doctrine, and its introduction by Attorney General Clark was then rewritten to provoke even more hysteria than initially intended. Clark's report was so egregious in its depiction of the so-called Communist threat within the U.S. government, that it was eventually rejected by the commission itself. But its publicity had served its purpose of inflaming public opinion.

Clark's witch-hunting was so closely connected to the Truman Doctrine foreign policy, that when the President sought to sell the nation on the urgency of backing up the British in the Greek and Turkish crises, by promulgating the Truman Doctrine, it was Clark—with no past or present connection to making foreign policy—who was sent on the hustings in the Midwest to sell the package.

It was the convergence of a drastically changed domestic and foreign policy posture that necessitated this new red scare. It claimed Henry Wallace in 1946, fired by Truman for a speech advocating close U.S.-Soviet ties; and Harry D. White, the architect of Bretton Woods, in 1947.

By the end of the Truman Administration, the spirit of economic and technological progress, revived and nourished by Roosevelt's administrations out of the early-1930s collapse, had been all but snuffed out. The optimism of the returning GIs had been replaced by fear and economic anxiety. The fear of atomic technology and irrational warfare—unleashed by Truman's militarily irrational decision to obliterate Hiroshima and Nagasaki—would infect an entire generation with deep psychological weaknesses. With the exception of the abortive attempt by John F. Kennedy to revive the optimism and economic progress of FDR, the seeds had been sown for 50 years of deepening disaster and abandonment of the American System of political economy. The crisis we face today, is a direct result of these policy blunders of the early post-war years.

Sergei Zubatov's 'Police Socialism' in Russia, and the Creation of Zionism

by Marjorie Mazel Hecht

Sergei Zubatov¹ is an almost unknown name today, but the legacy of this Russian secret-police head is still very much alive, 100 years later, in the ongoing Israel-Palestine conflict. It was Zubatov, a master of psychological warfare, who convinced thousands of young Russian radicals to give up ideas of universal social justice, and limit themselves to narrow goals of personal financial improvement within his "legal" trade unions. It was Zubatov who seized on Zionism and its "blood-and-soil" ideology as a perfect counterinsurgency belief system to remove Jewish radical youth from the Russian political arena. Zubatov organized, through his Jewish recruits, the first Russian Zionist congress, in 1902, which, for the first time, brought the knowledge of Zionism to a wide Russian audience. Simultaneously, Zubatov spawned and controlled terrorist and "revenge" cells, to carry out political violence and assassinations against selected enemies.

To understand, and resolve, the Jewish-Arab conflict today, one must see how Zubatov shaped the views of the early settlers of Palestine, those Russian immigrants who became the Zionist founders of Israel, around "blood and soil," socialism and terrorism. Zubatovism must also be placed in the larger context of British geopolitics—Britain's alliance with Russia's old landed families to curb Eurasian development, and its colonial manipulations of Arab landowners and, later, the general Arab population in the Mideast. This, combined with Britain's brutal treatment of the Jewish population of Palestine, in the first five decades of the 20th Century, and its colonial administration's deliberate pitting of Jews against Arabs and Arabs against Jews, makes it clear that the cycle of violence between Jew and Arab is not indigenous, and that it can be stopped.

In the 1880s, Russia was emerging from feudalism into the modern world. For a 25-year period before the 1905 Russian Revolution, Great Britain had waged a covert war to

crush the Russian industrialist faction, which was supported by the Romanov Tsars. The British feared that Russia would become the "United States of the East," a powerful, industrial republic. The assassination of Alexander II in 1881 was a turning point in this process. Alexander was called the Tsar-Liberator, because he abolished serfdom and brought Russia into a strategic alliance with Abraham Lincoln's United States, during the U.S. Civil War.

In its destabilization operation, Britain aided the fascist "Black Hundreds" pogroms against the Jews, and then encouraged Jewish financiers in the West to put economic pressure on the Tsar to stop the pogroms; they helped finance various revolutionary groups, and they simultaneously aided the "police socialism" countergangs to keep these groups in line; they maneuvered certain government policies and they financed terrorists to go after the same government officials whose policies they determined.

And, to cause further chaos, the British bought and paid for the Japanese war against Russia in 1903—a deal worked out by the King's financial adviser Sir Ernest Cassel and Cassel's American colleague, financier Jacob Schiff of Kuhn Loeb.

Russia, at the time, had enormous potential: vast natural resources; a rapidly growing urban workforce; a strong pro-growth faction, steeped in the intellectual tradition of Henry Carey and Friedrich List, the economists who inspired the American Whig policy; a frontier that promised to become a trade-bridge to the East; and the seeds of a revolutionary movement that envisioned its nation becoming an industrial socialist republic. In short, Russia had the potential for bringing East and West together in the spirit of Lyndon LaRouche's Eurasian Land-Bridge proposal today.

This potential is what the British Empire set out to destroy, using Zubatovism, the method named for the Moscow chief of the Russian secret police, the Okhrana, as one of its weapons. The Zubatov operation, from 1896 to 1905, was part of the overall subversion scheme, in particular targeting Russia's newly emancipated and politicized Jews. (Between 1895 and 1904, for example, there were 2,276 Jewish worker

1. This report is dedicated to the memory of Mr. Hillel Kempinski, archivist of the Bund library in New York City, a survivor of the concentration camps of both Hitler and Stalin, and a lover of truth and justice, who wanted the story of Zubatov and his agents to become better known in America.